Environmental Justice Advisory Committee on the Implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)

Recommendations on ARB's Proposed Early Action Measures Angela Johnson Meszaros, Committee Co-chair



Responsibilities

- 38591. (a) The state board, by July 1, 2007, shall convene an environmental justice advisory committee, of at least three members, to advise it in developing the scoping plan pursuant to Section 38561 and any other pertinent matter in implementing this division. The advisory committee shall be comprised of representatives from communities in the state with the most significant exposure to air pollution, including, but not limited to, communities with minority populations or low-income populations, or both.
- (b) The state board shall appoint the advisory committee members from nominations received from environmental justice organizations and community groups.



Objectives

Adopted by the Committee on March 15, 2007

Mission Statement of the Environmental Justice Advisory Committee on the Implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006

The mission of the Environmental Justice Committee on the Implementation of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2006 shall be to work cooperatively with all relevant bodies to provide the best possible advice to the California Air Resources Board on the development of the Scoping Plan called for by the Act and all other pertinent matters related to the implementation of

the Act. Through this advice the Committee seeks to provide helpful, workable recommendations on how best to ensure and encourage public engagement in the implementation of the Act and how best to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while maximizing the overall societal benefits, including reductions in other air pollutants, diversification of energy sources, and other benefits to the economy, environment, and public health.

Environmental Justice Advisory Committee on the Implementation of the Global Warming

Solutions Act of 2006 (AB 32)

Name	Organization	Region
Angela Johnson-Meszaros (co-chair)	California Environmental Rights Alliance	Los Angeles
Alternate: Jesse Marquez	Coalition for a Safe Environment	
Jane Williams (co-chair)	California Communities Against Toxics Los	Los Angeles
Alternate: Shabaka Heru	Society for Positive Action	
Chione Flegal	Latino Issues Forum	Bay Area
Alternate: Azibuike Akaba		
Henry Clark	West County Toxics Coalition	Bay Area
Alternate: Erica Swinney	Greenaction	
Bill Gallegos	Communities for a Better Environment	Bay Area
Alternate: Phillip Huang		
Tom Frantz	Association of Irritated Residents (AIR)	Central Valley
Alternate: Carolina Simunovic	Fresno Metro Ministries	
Jose Carmona	Clean Power Campaign	Central Valley
Alternate: Rosenda Mataka	Greyson Neighborhood Council	
Avinash Kar	Center on Race, Poverty & Environment	Central Valley
Alternate: Caroline Farrell		
Martha Arguello	Physicians for Social Responsibility Pacoima Beautiful	Los Angeles
Alternate: Marlene Grossman		
Diane Takvorian	Environmental Health Coalition	San Diego
Alternate: Laura Hunter		
Alternate at Large: Margaret Gordon	West Oakland Indicators Project	Bay Area

Why Does Climate Change Matter?

- Global climate change is real warming already underway
- Global warming poses a serious threat to the economic well-being, public health, natural resources, and environment of California
- Global warming will have detrimental effects on many of California's largest industries
- California, in its long standing tradition of environmental stewardship, has positioned itself at the forefront of climate protection efforts



Committee's Work

Reviewed staff's Early Action Report – 100 measures

Engaged in approx. 12 hours of public dialogue—

at

3 Committee Meetings

Reviewed 58 letters/emails submitted to

Developed reasonable, statutorily- based criteria and applied them to each suggested measure



Criteria for Evaluating Early Action Measures

- Is the measure technologically feasible?
- Does the measure cause increases in criteria or air toxics emissions (backsliding)?
- Are there co-pollutant reduction benefits from the measure?
- Does the measure have disproportionate (positive or negative) impacts on communities already facing unacceptably high environmental burdens?



Overview of Committee Recommendations

- Recommended only about 30% for inclusion on the early action list
- Better to start with a more robust list which allows for more refinement through the process (e.g., application of costeffectiveness standard, unforeseen rule development issues)
- Worst possible outcome—unnecessary delay in achieving reductions





Overview of Committee Recommendations

p. 16

Group 2 strategies include the remaining ARB GHG reduction actions proposed in the Climate Action Team report that were not ready for adoption as discrete early actions, stakeholders suggestions, and new ideas identified by ARB staff. Examples of strategies in this category include port electrification, and the use of cool materials to increase vehicle and building energy efficiency. Staff anticipates bringing these measures to the Board for adoption within the next three years. Some may begin implementation as rules prior to January 2010 but many will not.

Bulk of our recommendations are from Group 2 strategies

Why not add them to the list?



Overview of Committee Recommendations

Remove from Early Action list :

■ Low Carbon Fuel Standard

□ Reduction of HFC 134a emissions from nonprofessional servicing of cars



Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS)



pyright © 2005 Striphen Jack



Low Carbon Fuel Standard

- The Committee SUPPORTS reductions in the carbon content of transportation fuels
- The Committee DOES NOT recommend development of a Low Carbon Fuel Standard as an early action measure



Low Carbon Fuel Standard



Page 13

The LCFS as an early action would establish a "carbon content" standard for transportation fuels linked to the fuel's impact on GHG emissions. The goal is to reduce the "carbon intensity" of California's vehicle fuel by at least 10 percent by 2020. Carbon intensity refers to GHG emissions per unit of energy, in units such as grams of CO₂E per British Thermal Unit, used to power a vehicle.



What is the Low Carbon Fuel Standard?

-- DRAFT --

BOX 1: What if the LCFS were an absolute target instead of an intensity target?

A Low-Carbon Ft Part 1: Given BAU projections of increases in VMT of 1.76% per year in California between 2003 and 2025², California can expect an increase in VMT of approximately 25% between 2007 and 2020. Absent any change in average vehicle fuel efficiency, this increase in total driving would result in a 25% increase in fuel use. A 10% reduction in carbon intensity would result in an increase of 13% in *absolute* emissions³. Under the same assumptions, if the LCFS were defined as an *absolute* 10% emissions reduction, it would in effect require a reduction in carbon *intensity* of 31% by 2020⁴.

Project Directors

Alexander E. Farrell, UC Berkeley www.its.berkeley.edu/sustainabilitycenter

> Daniel Sperling, UC Davis www.its.ucdavis.edu

Contributors

S.M. Arons, A.R. Brandt, M.A. Delucchi, A. Eggert, A.E. Farrell, B.K. Haya, J. Hughes, B.M. Jenkins, A.D. Jones, D.M. Kammen, S.R. Kaffka, C.R. Knittel, D.M. Lemoine, E.W. Martin, M.W. Melaina, J.M. Ogden, R.J. Plevin, D. Sperling, B.T. Turner, R.B. Williams, C. Yang



What does that mean?

Table 1 Group 1 – ARB Discrete Early Action Measures Per Health & Safety Code Section 38560.5

Number	Sector	Description	2020 Reductions (MMT-GO ₂ E)
1-1	Transportation	Low Carbon Fuel Standard (LCFS)	10-20
1-2	Transportation	Reduction of HFC-134a emissions from non- professional servicing of motor vehicle air conditioning systems (MVACs)	1-2
1-3	Waste	Improved landfill methane capture	2-4
		Group 1 Total Reductions	13-26

- •In 2020 emissions from fuels will be higher than they are now
- Support technology forcing regs, however, this early action mix is too risk heavy
- •Support a wider range of measures that gets health enhancing reductions in communities right now



Possible Risks of LCFS: Negative Impacts on the Environment

Biofuels pose risks, U.N. reports

From the Associated Press

May 12, 2007

Biofuels like ethanol can help reduce global warming and create jobs for the rural poor, but the benefits may be undone by serious environmental problems and higher food prices, the U.N. has concluded in its first major report on bioenergy.

The report raised alarms about the potential negative effect of biofuels, just days after a climate conference in Bangkok said the world had the money and technology to stabilize global warming.

Biofuels, made from agricultural products such as corn, palm oil and sugar cane, have been seen by many as a cleaner, cheaper way to meet the world's soaring energy needs.

But environmentalists warn that biofuels may be as damaging as fossil fuels — a concern reflected throughout the report, released Tuesday in New York by U.N.-Energy, a consortium of 20 U.N. agencies and programs.

Although the report says bioenergy represents an "extraordinary opportunity" to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, it warns that "rapid growth in liquid biofuel production will make substantial demands on the world's land and water resources at a time when demand for both food and forest products is also rising rapidly."

Changes in the carbon content of soils and carbon stocks in forests might undercut some or all of the benefits of the greenhouse gas reductions, it said.



Possible Risks of LCFS: Negative Impacts on Food Prices



Tuesday, February 13, 2007

Ethanol Demand Threatens Food Prices

Rising corn prices are already affecting everything from the cost of tortillas in Mexico City to the cost of producing eggs in the United States.

By Brittany Sauser

The situation will only get worse, says <u>David Pimentel</u>, a professor in the department of entomology at Cornell University. "We have over a hundred different ethanol plants under construction now, so the situation is going to get desperate," he says.



Possible Risks of LCFS: Negative Impacts on Social Order

A Culinary and Cultural Staple in Crisis

Mexico Grapples With Soaring Prices for Corn -- and Tortillas

By Manuel Roig-Franzia Washington Post Foreign Service Saturday, January 27, 2007; A01

NEZAHUALCOYOTL, <u>Mexico</u> -- Thick, doughy tortillas roll hot off the conveyor belt all day at Aurora Rosales's little shop in this congested city built on a dry lake bed east of Mexico City.

Using cooking techniques that date to the Mayan empire, Rosales has never altered her recipe. Nor did her father, grandfather or great-grandfather.

On good days, the neighbors line up for her tortillas.

But these are not good days, and sometimes hours pass without any customers.

Mexico is in the grip of the worst tortilla crisis in its modern history. Dramatically rising international corn prices, spurred by demand for the grain-based fuel ethanol, have led to expensive tortillas. That, in turn, has led to lower sales for vendors such as Rosales and angry protests by consumers.



Possible Risks of LCFS: Negative Impacts on Public Health

Ethanol vehicles pose a significant risk to human health, study finds

Ethanol is widely touted as an eco-friendly, clean-burning fuel. But if every vehicle in the United States ran on fuel made primarily from ethanol instead of pure gasoline, the number of respiratory-related deaths and hospitalizations would likely increase, according to a new study by Stanford University atmospheric scientist Mark Z. Jacobson. His findings are published in the April 18 online edition of the journal *Environmental Science & Technology (ES&T)*.

"Ethanol is being promoted as a clean and renewable fuel that will reduce global warming and air pollution," said Jacobson, associate professor of civil and environmental engineering. "But our results show that a high blend of ethanol poses an equal or greater risk to public health than gasoline, which already causes significant health damage."





Low Carbon Fuel Standard

Summary

- □ Important area for carbon reductions
- □ Early Action Measures must be technologically feasible and not cause backsliding—currently available fuels do not meet this test
- □ Early Action Measures must avoid disproportionate negative impacts on low-income communities currently available fuels do not meet this test





Reduction of HFC134a from Non-Professional Servicing of Cars





Reduction of HFC134a from Non-Professional Servicing of Cars

- The Committee SUPPORTS reduction in HFCs, a very potent green house gas
- The regulation proposed by staff does not meet the requirements of AB 32





Reduction of HFC134a from Non-Professional Servicing of Cars

- Only measure targeting HFC reductions
- Very Regressive
- low-income people and people of color are disproportionately rely upon home-based auto repair and stop-gap repair options such as using the small can of HFC134a to fill leaking air conditioning units.



Instead of Small Can Ban

ARB undertake a broader review of possible HFC reductions, including

- Evacuation of refrigerants from decommissioned/stored cargo containers;
- Evacuation of HFCs from cars prior to scrappage
 - 33 million cars registered in California
 - Average of 2 pounds of HFCs in fully charged air conditioners



The Committee Recommends that this Board Vote to do 4 Things:

- Reduce HFC's without causing negative disproportionate impacts on low-income communities and communities of color;
- Continue work on developing a low-carbon fuel standard for implementation after early action period;
- Replace LCFS measure (and the resources needed for its accelerated implementation) with measures having highest co-pollutant reductions (e.g., port, refinery, and/or cement measures);
- Add to the list those items which staff indicated could be done by 2010 so those reductions are not lost



Doing Anything is not the Same as Doing Something